

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2–18 have been canceled. New claims 19–37 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 and 19–37 are pending.

**Specification**

The Final Office Action states that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The title has been amended to clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed. If the Examiner continues to object to the title, the Examiner is invited to suggest an acceptable title. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**Claims Objections**

Claim 2 is objected to because of the informalities. Claim 2 has been canceled. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Office Action. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants disagree with the Office Action's position. However, to expedite prosecution, claim 1 has been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/732,771  
Attorney Docket Number: 117846.02  
Filing Date: December 9, 2003

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 3 has been canceled. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1–8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Knuth [The Art of Computer Programming].

Claim 1, as amended, recites identifying a tag bit in a node, wherein a setting of the tag bit indicates a presence of a tag corresponding to the node. The Office Action asserts that Knuth discloses a “SKIP field” (Knuth, page 499) and equates the “SKIP field” of Knuth with the tag bit of claim 1. However, the “SKIP field” of Knuth is “a number that tells how many bits to skip when searching (for a word).” See Knuth, page 499. Knuth fails to teach or suggest that the “SKIP field” also somehow indicates a presence of a tag corresponding to the node. Indeed, the “SKIP field” is unrelated to whether a tag is present or not.

Claim 1, as amended, further recites identifying a tag mask field (having a plurality of tag mask bits) within the node based on a setting of the tag bit, wherein settings of the tag mask bits indicate a plurality of tags corresponding to the node. The Office Action asserts that Knuth discloses “1” (see Knuth, FIG. 33, node  $\epsilon$ ) and equates “1” of node  $\epsilon$  in Knuth with the tag mask field. However, Knuth fails to teach or suggest that the “1” in FIG. 33 has a plurality of tag mask bits, the setting of which indicate a plurality of tags corresponding to the node.

The Office Action asserts that “1” is “represented by “10” in binary. This is incorrect as “1” is represented as “1” in binary, not “10”. In any event, even assuming

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/732,771  
Attorney Docket Number: 117846.02  
Filing Date: December 9, 2003

that “1” is in fact represented by “10” in binary, Knuth still fails to teach or suggest that “10” in binary indicates a plurality of tags corresponding to the node. “1” or “10” in Knuth is unrelated to tags at all.

Additionally, the “1” of Knuth is actually a value of the “SKIP field” of the corresponding node (See Knuth, page 499: “the SKIP fields are shown as numbers within each non-header node of Fig. 33.”). As set forth above, the Office Action already asserts that the “SKIP field” is supposedly equivalent to the “tag bit” of claim 1. Claim 1 recites identifying a tag mask field within the node based on a setting of the tag bit. Hence, the Office Action asserts that the “SKIP field” of Knuth is equivalent to both the tag bit AND the tag mask field of claim 1. This is improper. It is pointed out that “all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Even assuming *arguendo* that the Office Action’s assumption that the “SKIP field” is equivalent to BOTH the tag bit AND the tag mask field of the node is correct, Knuth still fails to teach or suggest that the “SKIP field” is identified based on a setting of the “SKIP field” itself. Indeed, this interpretation would make no sense.

Claim 1 further recites determining a data component in the trie based on the plurality of tags (wherein settings of the tag mask bits indicate the plurality of tags). Knuth fails to teach or suggest this feature. Knuth discloses searching for the word “THE” (Knuth, page 499). Nowhere does Knuth teach or suggest that searching for the word “THE” includes determining information based on a plurality of tags (where settings of tag mask bits indicate the plurality of tags). Instead, Knuth merely searches for the desired word by examining a number (in the “SKIP field”) to determine a number of bits to skip when searching. This is unrelated to determining a data component in a trie based on a plurality of tags (wherein settings of tag mask bits indicate the plurality of tags).

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/732,771  
Attorney Docket Number: 117846.02  
Filing Date: December 9, 2003

It is pointed out that "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element is set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Also, "the identical invention must be shown [in the cited reference] in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). In the present case, Knuth fails to set forth each and every element in claim 1 as set forth above. Also, Knuth fails to show the "identical invention" in as complete detail as contained in claim 1. In fact, Knuth fails to teach or suggest claim 1 at all.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2–18 have been canceled. New claims 19–37 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knuth [The Art of Computer Programming] in view of the Admission [BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION, pages 1–4]. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/732,771  
Attorney Docket Number: 117846.02  
Filing Date: December 9, 2003

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/732,771  
Attorney Docket Number: 117846.02  
Filing Date: December 9, 2003

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: December 21, 2006

Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052-6399

By: 

Stephen Siu, Reg. No.: 48,303  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct telephone (425) 704-0669

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

December 21, 2006  
Date

  
Signature

Noemi Tovar  
Printed Name

Type of Response: Amendment  
Application Number: 10/732,771  
Attorney Docket Number: 117846.02  
Filing Date: December 9, 2003